UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,454	07/16/2003	Cheryl Fitzer-Attas	20555/1203432-US1	7700

7278 . 7590 03/22/2006

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P. O. BOX 5257
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257

EXAMINER	
STANDLEY, STEVEN H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1649	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,454	FITZER-ATTAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven H. Standley	1649	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-36, drawn to an A-beta peptide or homolog, classified in class 530, subclass 300.

IIA. Claims 37-56, drawn to a method of matching an individual for a vaccine, classified in class 435, 7.2.

III. Claim 57, drawn to a kit for matching vaccine, classified in class 530, subclass 300.

IV. Claim 58-59, drawn to a method of prevention plaques by administering a vaccine, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the methods of group II can be used to formulate a vaccine against alpha synuclein for injection in Parkinson's or Lewy Body disease.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in the M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to

constitute distinct inventions for the following reasons: Groups IV and II are related as processes of using and processes of making that can be practiced with materially different products. For instance, the methods of matching a vaccine of groups II-IV can be practiced with alpha synuclein, and the methods of using practiced in group IV can be practiced with alpha synuclein. Therefore the methods of making and the methods of using are each not required for the other. The also have different goals and different steps and require searches that are not coextensive. Therefore a search and examination of the methods of group II and group IV would constitute an undue burden, since the searches are entirely different and not coextensive, the classifications are different and the subject matter divergent.

Inventions I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process of using is a process of administering a vaccine, which can be performed with any vaccine, and in particular an alpha synuclein vaccine can be administered to reduce or inhibit the formation of amyloid plaques.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to <u>different</u> products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Groups I and III are distinct

products that are not required each for the other. Group I is an a-beta peptide product and Group III is a kit containing elements for making the product of group I. However, the kit can be used for an unrelated product such as designing a vaccine comprised of alpha synuclein. Moreover, an a-beta product does not require a kit for its design. The products are distinct and would require searches that are non-coextensive. Therefore a search and examination of the methods of group I and group III would constitute an undue burden, since the searches are entirely different and not coextensive, and the subject matter divergent.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions cannot be used together and have different modes of operation. Invention III is a kit or making an a-beta peptide and invention IV is a method of treating using an a-beta polypeptide as a vaccine. Thus, they do not work together and are not disclosed as working together. Further, they have different modes of operation. The invention of group III is a group of interrelated objects that support the design of a vaccine, and group IV is a method of treating. Therefore a search would not be co-extensive and examination of the two groups together would be a serious burden on the examiner.

Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially

different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the processes for using can be practiced with alpha synuclein instead of the a-beta of the instant kit.

Election of Species

Further, should applicant elect the methods of Group II, a further election of species is required. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: claim 46 (assessed as lack of an ability to induce T-cell response), Claim 47 (assessed as lack of ability to induce T-cell proliferation), claim 48 (assessed as a lack of ability to induce T-cell cytotoxicity), claim 49 (assessed as lack of ability to induce cytokines), claim 50 (assessed as lack of ability to detect specific T-cell activation markers), claim 51 (assessed as lack of ability to detect specific T-cell receptors), claim 52 (assessed for lack of fibrillogenicity), claim 53 (assessed for lack of beta sheet structure), claim 54 and 55 (assessed for lack of toxicity), claim 56 (assessed for ability to induce antibody response). The species are independent or distinct because they are all different additional steps to the method that measure distinctly different things with different aspects of cellular and bodily responses to vaccines.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, 'a method of matching a vaccine' is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Conclusion

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.
In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should

be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Standley whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3432**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on **(571) 272-0867**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

Steve Standley, Ph.D.
3/08/06

LORRAINE SPECTOR
PRIMARY EXAMINER